

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                   | F    | TLING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR          | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------|------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/701,775                        |      | 07/13/2001    | Leonid Solomonovich Raginskii | 9052-70                 | 8507             |
| 20792                             | 7590 | 06/20/2003    | •                             |                         |                  |
|                                   |      | BLEY & SAJOVI | EXAMINER                      |                         |                  |
| PO BOX 37428<br>RALEIGH, NC 27627 |      |               |                               | MCKANE, ELIZABETH L     |                  |
|                                   |      |               |                               | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                   |      |               |                               | 1744                    | 4                |
|                                   |      |               |                               | DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003 | ·                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ·   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | 09/701,775  | RAGINSKII ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Leigh McKane  | 1744   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this comm   | nunication app ars on the cov r sh et   | with th correspond nc address  |  |  |  |  |  |
| after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this c  If the period for reply specified above is less than thi  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum  | UNICATION. sions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may communication. rty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of m statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) M reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ths after the mailing date of this communication, even | r a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. IONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s  | s) filed on   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.   | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  Disposition of Claims  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) <u>23-25</u> is/are allowed.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7,8,10,11 and 14-18</u> is/are rejected.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6,9,12,13,19 and 20</u> is/are objected to.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to res  | striction and/or election requirement.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by   | the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a)⊠ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the prior  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a clair   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) 🗌 The translation of the foreign   | language provisional application has  | been received.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15) Acknowledgment is made of a clai  | m for domestic priority under 35 U.S.   | C. §§ 120 and/or 121.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   | " <b>—</b> `.   | 070 440 7  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)  | w (PTO-948) 5) Notice of  | w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)<br>of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office<br>PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)  | Office Action Summary   | Part of Paper No. 9  |  |  |  |  |  |



Art Unit: 1744

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 fails to depend from any preceding claim. However, it has been treated as if it depends from claim 1. Moreover, the term "plates" in claim 11 lacks positive antecedent basis because the terminology "blades" has been previously used.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-5, 7, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karpacheva et al (Abstract of SU 764698).

Karpacheva et al teaches an apparatus having a perforated sloping spiral ramp 7 within cylindrical process chamber 1. The gradient of the spiral is between 4 and 30°. The chamber 1 includes inlets and outlets 2-4 for solids and fluids. A pulse generator 5 is disposed to create pulses in fluids within the chamber. The ramp 7 includes perforations which comprise inclined



Art Unit: 1744

slits formed between blades 8. See Figures. From the Figures the blades appear to be inclined at an angle less than 60°.

As to the intended use of the apparatus, the manner or method in which a machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself, *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 7. Claims 8, 10, 11, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karpacheva et al.

With respect to claims 8, 10, 11, and 21 and the length of the inclined slits, the width of the blades, and the distance between the blades and the side walls, these limitations are not felt to be patentably significant since they at most relate to the size of the article under consideration



Art Unit: 1744

which is not ordinarily a matter of invention. <u>In re Yount</u>, 36 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 775, 171 F. 2d 317, 80 USPQ 141.

### Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 6, 9, 12, 13, 19, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: With respect to claims 6 and 19, although Karpacheva et al teaches a spiral ramp, it does not disclose a spiral ramp having a gradient in an upper zone that is greater than in the lower zone. In the apparatus of Karpacheva et al, the gradient is lower is the upper zone. As to claims 9 and 20, Karpacheva et al does not disclose that the blades are in the form of a trapezium and fastened to a central blade support. With respect to claims 12 and 13, the pulsator of Karpacheva et al is located outside the process chamber.
- 10. Claims 23-25 are allowed.
- 11. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: Karpacheva et al fails to teach or disclose that the apparatus can be used in a method for dissolving nuclear fuel pins.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Art Unit: 1744

### Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Weet (U.S. Patent No. 4,022,638) teaches an apparatus including a helical conveyor for solid/liquid contact.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh McKane whose telephone number is 703-305-3387. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Wednesday (7:15 am-4:45 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 703-308-2920. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Leigh) McKane Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1744

elm

June 16, 2003